



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,724	12/21/2001	Masatoshi Todokoro	18920.0030	5131

23517 7590 08/01/2003

SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN, LLP  
3000 K STREET, NW  
BOX IP  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

DEL SOLE, JOSEPH S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1722

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n N .

10/023,724

Applicant(s)

TODOKORO, MASATOSHI

Examiner

Joseph S. Del Sole

Art Unit

1722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 6-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. Figures 16 and 23 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. As stated at page 19, line 20 and page 20, line 17 of the specification, these figures are described by the inventor to be conventional. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because **a)** the abstract is currently over 150 words and must be shortened (see above). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: **a)** at page 2, line 8 "code" should be changed to --cord--.

Art Unit: 1722

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification discusses brushes to be alternatively carbon or alloy (the alloy brush is discussed to be copper alloy). Claim 8 indicates that the carbon brush is further limited as an alloy brush, however there is no enablement in the specification for such a combined brush.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 1722

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al (4,846,643) in view of Rosenberg et al (3,973,097).

Yamamoto et al teach a cotton candy making apparatus having a tray (Fig 1, #26) that can freely be assembled to and disassembled from a main body (Fig 1, #10), the cotton candy making apparatus having a main power supply switch (Fig 1, #80) at an upper portion of the main body.

Yamamoto et al fail to teach the switch adapted to be locked by being rotated in a predetermined direction while being depressed.

Rosenberg et al teach a switch adapted to be locked by being rotated in a predetermined direction while being depressed (col 3, lines 57-68) for the purpose of preventing a device from accidentally being turned on.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Yamamoto et al with a switch adapted to be locked by being rotated in a predetermined direction while being depressed as taught by Rosenberg et al because it increases the safety of operation of a device.

10. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan (4,793,782) in view of Rosenberg et al (3,973,097).

Sullivan teaches a cotton candy making apparatus having a tray (Fig 1, #10) that can freely be assembled to and disassembled from a main body (Fig 1, #12), the cotton

Art Unit: 1722

candy making apparatus having a main power supply switch (Fig 1) at an upper portion of the main body.

Sullivan fails to teach the switch adapted to be locked by being rotated in a predetermined direction while being depressed.

Rosenberg et al teach a switch adapted to be locked by being rotated in a predetermined direction while being depressed (col 3, lines 57-68) for the purpose of preventing a device from accidentally being turned on.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Sullivan with a switch adapted to be locked by being rotated in a predetermined direction while being depressed as taught by Rosenberg et al because it increases the safety of operation of a device.

11. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammon (5,766,643) in view of Rosenberg et al (3,973,097).

Hammon teaches a cotton candy making apparatus (Fig 1, #10) having a tray (Fig 1, #14) that can freely be assembled to and disassembled from a main body (Fig 1, #12), the cotton candy making apparatus having a main power supply switch (Fig 1) at an upper portion of the main body.

Hammon fails to teach the switch adapted to be locked by being rotated in a predetermined direction while being depressed.

Art Unit: 1722

Rosenberg et al teach a switch adapted to be locked by being rotated in a predetermined direction while being depressed (col 3, lines 57-68) for the purpose of preventing a device from accidentally being turned on.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Hammon with a switch adapted to be locked by being rotated in a predetermined direction while being depressed as taught by Rosenberg et al because it increases the safety of operation of a device.

12. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al (4,846,643) and Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) in view of Fukuda et al (5,156,082).

Yamamoto et al and Rosenberg et al teach the apparatus as discussed above.

Yamamoto et al fail to teach an auxiliary switch mechanism in which contacts are closed by properly attaching the tray to the main body, whereby power is designed not to be supplied by a main power supply switch unless the contacts of the auxiliary switch mechanism are closed.

Fukuda et al teach an appliance having an auxiliary switch mechanism in which contacts are closed by properly attaching a tray (Fig 11, #24) to a main body, whereby power is designed not to be supplied by a main power supply switch unless the contacts of the auxiliary switch mechanism are closed (col 5, line 48 - col 6, line 27) for the purpose of preventing operation of the appliance before the appliance is properly set up (col 1, lines 5-57).

Art Unit: 1722

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Yamamoto et al with an auxiliary switch mechanism in which contacts are closed by properly attaching a tray (or analogous appliance feature) to a main body, whereby power is designed not to be supplied by a main power supply switch unless the contacts of the auxiliary switch mechanism are closed as taught by Fukuda et al because it prevents improper operation of an appliance, possibly preventing harm.

13. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan (4,793,782) and Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) in view of Fukuda et al (5,156,082).

Sullivan and Rosenberg et al teach the apparatus as discussed above.

Sullivan fails to teach an auxiliary switch mechanism in which contacts are closed by properly attaching the tray to the main body, whereby power is designed not to be supplied by a main power supply switch unless the contacts of the auxiliary switch mechanism are closed.

Fukuda et al teach an appliance having an auxiliary switch mechanism in which contacts are closed by properly attaching a tray (Fig 11, #24) to a main body, whereby power is designed not to be supplied by a main power supply switch unless the contacts of the auxiliary switch mechanism are closed (col 5, line 48 - col 6, line 27) for the purpose of preventing operation of the appliance before the appliance is properly set up (col 1, lines 5-57).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Sullivan with an auxiliary



Art Unit: 1722

switch mechanism in which contacts are closed by properly attaching a tray (or analogous appliance feature) to a main body, whereby power is designed not to be supplied by a main power supply switch unless the contacts of the auxiliary switch mechanism are closed as taught by Fukuda et al because it prevents improper operation of an appliance, possibly preventing harm.

14. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammon (5,766,643) and Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) in view of Fukuda et al (5,156,082).

Hammon and Rosenberg et al teach the apparatus as discussed above.

Hammon fails to teach an auxiliary switch mechanism in which contacts are closed by properly attaching the tray to the main body, whereby power is designed not to be supplied by a main power supply switch unless the contacts of the auxiliary switch mechanism are closed.

Fukuda et al teach an appliance having an auxiliary switch mechanism in which contacts are closed by properly attaching a tray (Fig 11, #24) to a main body, whereby power is designed not to be supplied by a main power supply switch unless the contacts of the auxiliary switch mechanism are closed (col 5, line 48 - col 6, line 27) for the purpose of preventing operation of the appliance before the appliance is properly set up (col 1, lines 5-57).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Hammon with an auxiliary switch mechanism in which contacts are closed by properly attaching a tray (or analogous appliance feature) to a main body, whereby power is designed not to be

Art Unit: 1722

supplied by a main power supply switch unless the contacts of the auxiliary switch mechanism are closed as taught by Fukuda et al because it prevents improper operation of an appliance, possibly preventing harm.

15. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al (4,846,643) and Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) in view of either Tsumita et al (4,842,502) or Wallace et al (3,232,244).

Yamamoto et al and Rosenberg et al teach the apparatus as discussed above.

Yamamoto et al fail to teach a threaded portion provided on a cover of the rotary pot which is adapted to be connected to a shaft, whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated.

Tsumita et al teach a cotton candy machine having a cover (Fig 4, #15) having a threaded portion which is adapted to be connected to a shaft (Fig 1, #6), whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated (col 2, lines 13-43) for the purpose of constructing the cover to be non rotating (col 2, lines 24-29). Wallace et al teach a cotton candy machine having a cover (Fig 1, #41) having a threaded portion which is adapted to be connected to a shaft (Fig 2, #36) whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated (col 2, lines 34-44) for the purpose of providing a safety feature to prevent inadvertent contact and burns.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Yamamoto et al with a cover having a threaded portion which is adapted to be connected to a shaft whereby the

Art Unit: 1722

cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated as taught by either Tsumita et al because it enables the cover to be stationary while other features of the machine rotate or Wallace et al because it is a safety feature to prevent inadvertent contact.

16. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan (4,793,782) and Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) in view of either Tsumita et al (4,842,502) or Wallace et al (3,232,244).

Sullivan and Rosenberg et al teach the apparatus as discussed above.

Sullivan fails to teach a threaded portion provided on a cover of the rotary pot which is adapted to be connected to a shaft, whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated.

Tsumita et al teach a cotton candy machine having a cover (Fig 4, #15) having a threaded portion which is adapted to be connected to a shaft (Fig 1, #6), whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated (col 2, lines 13-43) for the purpose of constructing the cover to be non rotating (col 2, lines 24-29). Wallace et al teach a cotton candy machine having a cover (Fig 1, #41) having a threaded portion which is adapted to be connected to a shaft (Fig 2, #36) whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated (col 2, lines 34-44) for the purpose of providing a safety feature to prevent inadvertent contact and burns.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Sullivan with a cover having a

Art Unit: 1722

threaded portion which is adapted to be connected to a shaft whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated as taught by either Tsumita et al because it enables the cover to be stationary while other features of the machine rotate or Wallace et al because it is a safety feature to prevent inadvertent contact.

17. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammon (5,766,643) and Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) in view of either Tsumita et al (4,842,502) or Wallace et al (3,232,244).

Hammon and Rosenberg et al teach the apparatus as discussed above.

Hammon fails to teach a threaded portion provided on a cover of the rotary pot which is adapted to be connected to a shaft, whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated.

Tsumita et al teach a cotton candy machine having a cover (Fig 4, #15) having a threaded portion which is adapted to be connected to a shaft (Fig 1, #6), whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated (col 2, lines 13-43) for the purpose of constructing the cover to be non rotating (col 2, lines 24-29). Wallace et al teach a cotton candy machine having a cover (Fig 1, #41) having a threaded portion which is adapted to be connected to a shaft (Fig 2, #36) whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated (col 2, lines 34-44) for the purpose of providing a safety feature to prevent inadvertent contact and burns.

Art Unit: 1722

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Hammon with a cover having a threaded portion which is adapted to be connected to a shaft whereby the cover can be assembled to and disassembled from the rotary pot by being rotated as taught by either Tsumita et al because it enables the cover to be stationary while other features of the machine rotate or Wallace et al because it is a safety feature to prevent inadvertent contact.

18. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al (4,846,643) and Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) in view of Nimura (4,404,487).

Yamamoto et al and Rosenberg et al teach the apparatus as discussed above. Yamamoto et al further teaches a heater (Fig 1, #62) in the rotary pot.

Yamamoto et al fail to teach brushes adapted to be biased with springs employed for brush devices for supplying electric current to a heater of a rotary pot by providing carbon brushes which are each biased in a slip ring direction with a spring within a brush holder.

Nimura teaches a brushes (Fig 2, #7 and 7') adapted to be biased with springs (Fig 2, #11 and 11') for supplying electric current by providing carbon brushes (col 2, line 65) which are each biased in a slip ring direction (Fig 2, #3) with a spring (Fig 2, #11 and 11') within a brush holder (Fig 2, #8) for the purpose of providing electric power (col 1, lines 5-15) in a stable and environment without rattling or jolting while making good contact.

Art Unit: 1722

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Yamamoto et al with a notoriously well known carbon brush, spring, slip ring, brush holder electric current supplying system as taught by Nimura because it enables stable supply of electric current when needed by an machine.

19. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan (4,793,782) and Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) in view of Nimura (4,404,487).

Sullivan and Rosenberg et al teach the apparatus as discussed above. Sullivan further teaches a heater (Fig 2, #25) in the rotary pot.

Sullivan fails to teach brushes adapted to be biased with springs employed for brush devices for supplying electric current to a heater of a rotary pot by providing carbon brushes which are each biased in a slip ring direction with a spring within a brush holder.

Nimura teaches a brushes (Fig 2, #7 and 7') adapted to be biased with springs (Fig 2, #11 and 11') for supplying electric current by providing carbon brushes (col 2, line 65) which are each biased in a slip ring direction (Fig 2, #3) with a spring (Fig 2, #11 and 11') within a brush holder (Fig 2, #8) for the purpose of providing electric power (col 1, lines 5-15) in a stable and environment without rattling or jolting while making good contact.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Sullivan with a notoriously well known carbon brush, spring, slip ring, brush holder electric current supplying

Art Unit: 1722

system as taught by Nimura because it enables stable supply of electric current when needed by an machine.

20. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammon (5,766,643) and Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) in view of Nimura (4,404,487).

Hammon and Rosenberg et al teach the apparatus as discussed above.

Hammon further teaches a heater (Fig 3, #36) in the rotary pot, the heater being electrically supplied with brushes for sliding engagement with slip rings (col 4, lines 32-40).

Hammon fails to teach the brushes adapted to be biased with springs employed by providing carbon brushes which are each biased in a slip ring direction with a spring within a brush holder.

Nimura teaches a brushes (Fig 2, #7 and 7') adapted to be biased with springs (Fig 2, #11 and 11') for supplying electric current by providing carbon brushes (col 2, line 65) which are each biased in a slip ring direction (Fig 2, #3) with a spring (Fig 2, #11 and 11') within a brush holder (Fig 2, #8) for the purpose of providing electric power (col 1, lines 5-15) in a stable and environment without rattling or jolting while making good contact.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Hammon with a notoriously well known carbon brush, spring, slip ring, brush holder electric current supplying system as taught by Nimura because it enables stable supply of electric current when needed by an machine.

Art Unit: 1722

21. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al (4,846,643), Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) and Nimura (4,404,487) in view of Mukai et al (5,744,892).

Yamamoto et al, Rosenberg et al and Nimura teach the apparatus as discussed above.

Yamamoto et al fail to the brushes being alloy.

Mukai et al teach a brush and slip ring arrangement wherein the brush is made of a copper alloy (col 4, lines 62-64) for the purpose of making the brush light in weight (col 2, lines 50-57).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Yamamoto et al with an alloy brush as taught by Mukai et al because it enables a lighter weight brush to be used.

22. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan (4,793,782), Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) and Nimura (4,404,487) in view of Mukai et al (5,744,892).

Sullivan, Rosenberg et al and Nimura teach the apparatus as discussed above.

Sullivan fails to teach the brushes being alloy.

Mukai et al teach a brush and slip ring arrangement wherein the brush is made of a copper alloy (col 4, lines 62-64) for the purpose of making the brush light in weight (col 2, lines 50-57).



Art Unit: 1722

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Sullivan with an alloy brush as taught by Mukai et al because it enables a lighter weight brush to be used.

23. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammon (5,766,643), Rosenberg et al (3,973,097) and Nimura (4,404,487) in view of Mukai et al (5,744,892).

Hammon, Rosenberg et al and Mukai et al teach the apparatus as discussed above.

Hammon fails to teach the brushes being alloy.

Mukai et al teach a brush and slip ring arrangement wherein the brush is made of a copper alloy (col 4, lines 62-64) for the purpose of making the brush light in weight (col 2, lines 50-57).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to have modified the invention of Hammon with an alloy brush as taught by Mukai et al because it enables a lighter weight brush to be used.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

24. Claims 3-5 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

25. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest a tray for a cotton candy making

Art Unit: 1722

apparatus being translucent, wherein a light emitting portion is provided in the main body of the apparatus for illuminating cotton candy made in the interior of the tray.

### **Correspondence**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph S. Del Sole whose telephone number is (703) 308-6295. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Wanda Walker, can be reached at (703) 308-0457. The official fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310 for non-after finals and (703) 872-9311 for after finals.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

J.S.D.  
July 22, 2003



ROBERT DAVIS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1300-1700

2/28/07